

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ON/

06/29/2007

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ELECTRONIC

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,564	03/27/2006	Jean-Philippe Pascal	273837US0PCT	4335
22850 OBLON SPIV	7590 06/29/200 /AK_MCCLELLAND	EXAMINER		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			CHOI, FRANK I	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
•				<u></u>
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/539,564	PASCAL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Frank I. Choi	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u></u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	,					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable to the examination of the examination o	cepted or b)□ objected to	•				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,	•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20051213,20060717. 	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/539,564

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for aqueous sodium bicarbonate solutions and a method of application of aqueous sodium bicarbonate to elements of the human environment, does not reasonably provide enablement for an acaricidal aqueous solution comprising sodium bicarbonate and no other acaricidal substance and a method of treating elements of the human environment with an acaricidal aqueous solution comprising 10 g/l of sodium bicarbonate. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The nature of the invention:

The claimed invention discloses an acaricidal aqueous solution comprising at least 10 g/l of sodium bicarbonate which is free of any other acaricidal substance.

The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art:

The prior art discloses aqueous sodium bicarbonate solutions and acaricidal compositions containing solid sodium bicarbonate. See 35 USC 103 rejection below, US Pat. 5,518,987, WO 93 22915 and EP 0 061 876. As such, predictability in the art appears to be low as to the acaricidal activity of aqueous sodium bicarbonate solutions free of other acaricides.

The amount of direction or guidance present and the presence or absence of working examples:

Application/Control Number: 10/539,564

Art Unit: 1616

The Specification provides examples of sodium bicarbonate solutions and experiments testing the efficacy thereof. However, there is no evidence that the aqueous solutions of sodium bicarbonate are acaricidal. In fact, the Specification indicates that the acarids do not absorb the aqueous sodium bicarbonate solution and that only when the water evaporates is the sodium bicarbonate effective against the acarids. This is supported by the tests disclosed. See Specification, Page 2, lines 15-28, Page 4, lines 20-38, Page 5-8.

The breadth of the claims and the quantity of experimentation needed:

The claims are broad in that they claim that the aqueous solution of sodium bicarbonate is acaricidal. Given that the experiments show that the aqueous solutions of sodium bicarbonate have no effect on mites, it appears that one of ordinary skill in the art would be required to do undue experimentation in order to determine at what concentration and rate of application an aqueous solution of sodium bicarbonate would be effective as an acaricide.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: evaporation of the water such that the sodium bicarbonate crystallizes in the form of fine grains which adhere to the outer surface of the acarids. As indicated above, the specification discloses that the acarids do not absorb the aqueous sodium bicarbonate solution and there is no evidence that the said solution itself is acaricidal. As such, treatment of the elements of the human environment without evaporation, formation of sodium bicarbonate crystals in the form of fine grains and adherence to the outer surface of the mite

Art Unit: 1616

Page 4

would appear to be ineffective. As such, the methods steps are essential and must be included in the method claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Remington's.

Remington's expressly discloses 1%, 5%, 7.5% and 8.4% solutions of sodium

bicarbonate (page 796).

Conclusion

A facsimile center has been established in Technology Center 1600. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 8:45 AM to 4:45 PM. The telecopier number for accessing the facsimile machine is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Choi whose telephone number is (571)272-0610. Examiner maintains a compressed schedule and may be reached Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 6:00 am – 4:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Johann R. Richter, can be reached at (571)272-0646. Additionally, Technology Center 1600's Receptionist and Customer Service can be reached at (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frank Choi

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1600

June 25, 2007

ohann R. Richter

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1600